

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 14, and 27. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-27 are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §101, claims 1-5, 8-18 and 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,000,187 to Messinger et al. (hereinafter “Messinger”) and claims 6, 7, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Messinger et. al. in view of Raghavan et. al. “Interactive Evaluation of Assembly Sequences Using Augmented Reality” (hereinafter “Raghavan”).

II. Formalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing the references listed on modified form PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 25, 2003.

The Examiner failed to acknowledge the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. §119(e), as well as the receipt of a certified copy of the priority document. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to check the appropriate boxes on the Form PTO-326 indicating that the claim for priority is acknowledged and that the certified copy of the priority document has been received. In addition, the Examiner failed to indicate whether the drawings are accepted or objected to. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to check the appropriate box on the form PTO-326 indicating that the drawings are accepted.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because it recites “[a] computer program product comprising instructions.” Applicant has amended claim 27 to recite a tangible embodiment and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 27.

IV. Prior Art Rejections

1. Claims 1-5, 8-18, and 21-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Messinger. Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection in view of the following comments.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *See* MPEP §2131.

Of the rejected claims, only claims 1, 14 and 27 are independent. With reference to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Messinger does not disclose or suggest at least the following feature recited in claim 1: “a context manager automatically determining a current context of the user by at least one of a position in space, a work object and a work task of the user, dynamically selecting the context objects as a function of the current context of the user, and automatically offering the selected context objects to the user without requiring the user to make individual preselections”

The Examiner contends that figure 2 and col. 5, lines 52-65 of Messinger discloses these unique features of claim 1 (*see* page 3 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Messinger discloses a method and apparatus for software technical support and training. “A sequence of instructions associated with a respective task is displayed in the graphical overlay upon selection of a task indication by the user.” *See* Abstract. “A user . . . learns a sequence of operations associated with a task through actively interfacing with the GUI

window.” See col. 2, lines 34-36. In Messenger, the user first has to preselect the sequence of operations of a respective software application to be learned. As a result of that preselection, the system provides a list of steps that have to be undertaken to complete a task. As a consequence, the user in Messenger is always required to select the context himself.

In other words, Messenger does not provide a context manager that automatically offers the task the user needs to learn based on a determination of the context of the user and a dynamic selection of the context objects. In the case of Messenger that would mean that the system would need to be capable of determining the level of knowledge of the user and, based on that information, displaying the steps that the user has to follow to learn the respective task. In short, in Messenger, there is no disclosure of automatically determining the tasks based on the context of the user. In addition, Messenger does not disclose or suggest automatically offering the context objects selected by the context manager without requiring the user to make individual preselections. In Messenger, the user has to determine the context and as such clearly makes individual preselections.

As a result, Messenger fails to disclose or suggest “a context manager automatically determining a current context of the user by at least one of a position in space, a work object and a work task of the user, dynamically selecting the context objects as a function of the current context of the user, and automatically offering the selected context objects to the user without requiring the user to make individual preselections”, as recited in claim 1. Consequently, Messenger does not describe each and every element as set forth in the claim, either expressly or inherently. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Messenger fails to anticipate claim 1, and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 over Messenger be reconsidered and withdrawn. Claims 2-5 and 8-13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 14-18 and 21-26 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 14 and 27 recite features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the features argued above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, arguments analogous to those presented with respect to claim 1 are respectfully submitted to apply with equal force here. For at least substantially analogous reasons, therefore, independent claims 14 and 27 are patentably distinguishable from Messinger. Claims 15-18 and 21-26 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 14.

3. Claims 6-7 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Messinger in view of Raghavan. Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection in view of the following comments.

Claims 6-7 and 19-20 depend on claims 1 and 14, respectively. Applicant has already demonstrated that Messinger does not meet all the requirements of independent claim 1. Raghavan is relied upon only for its alleged disclosure of recognizing real objects (*see* page 5 of the Office Action) and as such fails to cure the deficient disclosure of Messinger. Together, the combined teachings of these references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of claims 1 and 14. Since claims 6-7 and 19-20 depend on claims 1 and 14, respectively, they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

/Nataliya Dvorson/
Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

Date: June 25, 2007